

Comment on “Theoretical Analysis of the Transmission Phase Shift of a Quantum Dot in the Presence of Kondo Correlations”

In a recent Letter [1], Jerez, Vitushinsky and Lavagna (JVL) propose a new theoretical interpretation of the experimental measurements [2] of the transmission phase shift, δ_{ABI} , through a quantum dot (QD) in the Kondo regime, as deduced from placing the QD in an open double-slit Aharonov-Bohm interferometer (ABI). Describing the QD, which is coupled to two reservoirs via one-dimensional leads, by the single level Anderson model (SLAM) [their Eq. (1)], JVL argue that at zero magnetic field ($H = 0$) the conductance through the QD is given by $G \propto \sin^2(\delta_G)$, with $\delta_G = \delta_{ABI}/2$. In this Comment we question the validity of this result for the SLAM, since it fails in several exactly known limits. Whether the SLAM succeeds to describe the experiment [2] is irrelevant to the theoretical problem posed here [3].

Without interactions ($U = 0$), JVL’s SLAM can be solved exactly: assuming the scattering solution $A_\ell e^{ikx} + B_\ell e^{-ikx}$ to the left of the QD, and $A_r e^{-ikx} + B_r e^{ikx}$ to its right, the solution is

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_\ell \\ B_r \end{bmatrix} = S_k \begin{bmatrix} A_\ell \\ A_r \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

with $E_k = -2t \cos k$ (we use all the notations of Ref. [1]) and with the scattering matrix given by

$$S_k = \begin{bmatrix} -1 + 2i \sin k \mathcal{G}_k V_L^2/t & 2i \sin k \mathcal{G}_k V_L V_R/t \\ 2i \sin k \mathcal{G}_k V_L V_R/t & -1 + 2i \sin k \mathcal{G}_k V_R^2/t \end{bmatrix} \\ \equiv -e^{i\delta_k} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \delta_k - iv_- \sin \delta_k & iv_+ \sin \delta_k \\ iv_+ \sin \delta_k & \cos \delta_k + iv_- \sin \delta_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_k = [E_k - \epsilon_0 + e^{ik}\Gamma/2]^{-1}$, with $\Gamma = 2(V_L^2 + V_R^2)/t$, $\cot \delta_k = -[E_k - \epsilon_0 + (\Gamma/2) \cos k]/[(\Gamma/2) \sin k]$, while $v_+ = \sin 2\theta$ and $v_- = \cos 2\theta$, with $\tan \theta = V_L/V_R$. When $H = 0$, S_k is the same for both spin indices, and we thus omit the spin index σ .

JVL indeed write down expressions which are equivalent to our Eq. (2) (with $V_L = V_R$, i.e. $v_+ = 1$, $v_- = 0$), but they then replace this equation (at the Fermi level, $k = k_F$) by their Eq. (4),

$$S_{k_F\sigma}^{JVL} = e^{i\delta} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \delta_\sigma & i \sin \delta_\sigma \\ i \sin \delta_\sigma & \cos \delta_\sigma \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

with the modified overall phase $\delta = \delta_\uparrow + \delta_\downarrow$ (and a different sign). This amounts to multiplying Eq. (2) by an additional factor, $-C_\sigma = -e^{i\delta-\sigma}$, which JVL attribute to generalizations of Levinson’s theorem. Although the conductance is still given by $G \propto \sum_\sigma \sin^2 \delta_\sigma$, the ABI phase δ_{ABI} is then claimed to be equal to δ . For $H = 0$,

one has $\delta_\uparrow = \delta_\downarrow = \delta/2$, and therefore JVL conclude that $\delta_G = \delta/2 = \delta_{ABI}/2$.

However, for $U = 0$ Eq. (3) *contradicts the exact solution* (2), which does *not* contain the factor $-C_\sigma$. More generally, at zero-temperature but $U \neq 0$, one has $G \propto \sum_\sigma \text{Im} \mathcal{G}_{d\sigma}(0) \propto \sum_\sigma \sin^2 \delta_\sigma$, where $\mathcal{G}_{d\sigma}(0) \equiv e^{i\delta_\sigma} |\mathcal{G}_{d\sigma}(0)|$ is the exact local Green’s function of the SLAM at the Fermi energy [4, 5]. Moreover, Eq. (2) of [5] shows generally that the complex transmission amplitude $T_{d\sigma}$ through a SLAM QD is proportional to $\mathcal{G}_{d\sigma}(0)$, implying that $\delta_{ABI} = \arg T_{d\sigma} \equiv \delta_\sigma$ is *the same* as δ_G , again contradicting JVL’s $\delta_G = \delta_{ABI}/2$ [6].

We conclude that JVL’s Eq. (4) does *not* follow from the SLAM. Either the SLAM is not compatible with the Levinson theorem, or the application of this theorem to the SLAM was done incorrectly. In either case, if JVL believe that their Eq. (4) is correct then they should supply its explicit derivation from a well defined model.

We acknowledge clarifying correspondence with M. Lavagna. This work is supported by an ISF center of excellence (TAU), by ISF, Minerva and BSF (WIS), by DIP (WIS and LMU), and by DFG, SFB631 (LMU).

A. Aharony and O. Entin-Wohlman

Department of Physics, Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheva 84105, Israel, and School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

Y. Oreg

Department of Condensed Matter Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

J. von Delft

Physics Department, ASC and CeNS, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, D-80333 München

PACS numbers: 75.20.Hr, 72.15.Qm, 73.21.La, 73.23.Hk

-
- [1] A. Jerez, P. Vitushinsky, and M. Lavagna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 127203 (2005).
 - [2] Y. Ji, M. Heiblum, D. Sprinzak, D. Mahalu, and H. Shtrikman, Science **290**, 779 (2000); Y. Ji, M. Heiblum, and H. Shtrikman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 076601 (2002).
 - [3] Near a resonance, the conductance of the open ABI is sensitive to the second branch of the ABI, possibly affecting the double slit interpretation of the data [A. Aharony and O. Entin-Wohlman, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 073311 (2005)].
 - [4] T. K. Ng and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1768 (1988).
 - [5] Ulrich Gerland, Jan von Delft, T. A. Costi and Yuval Oreg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3710 (2000).
 - [6] The theoretical prediction $\delta_G = \delta_{ABI}$ was also found [A. Aharony, O. Entin-Wohlman, and Y. Imry, Physica E **29**, 283 (2005)] to be consistent with the experimental data in the Coulomb blockade regime [R. Schuster, E. Buks, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, V. Umansky, and H. Shtrikman, Nature (London) **385**, 417 (1997)].